

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

YOLANDA SILVA,

Plaintiff,

V.

NANCY JACKSON,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:25-cv-00458-EPG (PC)

ORDER FOR PLAINTIFF TO SHOW  
CAUSE WHY THIS ACTION SHOULD  
NOT BE DISMISSED WITHOUT  
PREJUDICE FOR FAILURE TO EXHAUST  
ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES BEFORE  
FILING THIS LAWSUIT

## RESPONSE DUE IN THIRTY DAYS

Plaintiff Yolanda Silva is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* in this civil rights action. Plaintiff filed the operative complaint on April 21, 2025. (ECF No. 1). Plaintiff claims that another inmate attacked her. (*Id.* at 3).

It appears from the face of the Complaint that Plaintiff did not exhaust her administrative remedies before filing this action. (*Id.* at 2). Accordingly, the Court will order Plaintiff to file a response within thirty days, explaining why this action should not be dismissed for failure to exhaust available administrative remedies. Such a dismissal would be without prejudice, so that Plaintiff may refile the action after exhausting administrative remedies, to the extent those remedies are still available to her. In the alternative, Plaintiff may file a notice of voluntary dismissal, in which case the Court will dismiss Plaintiff's case without prejudice to Plaintiff refiling the complaint after exhausting administrative remedies.

1           **I.        LEGAL STANDARDS**

2           Section 1997e(a) of the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (“PLRA”) provides that  
3 “[n]o action shall be brought with respect to prison conditions under [42 U.S.C. § 1983], or any  
4 other Federal law, by a prisoner confined in any jail, prison, or other correctional facility until  
5 such administrative remedies as are available are exhausted.” 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a).

6           Prisoners are required to exhaust the available administrative remedies prior to filing  
7 suit. *Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. 199, 211 (2007); *McKinney v. Carey*, 311 F.3d 1198, 1199–1201  
8 (9th Cir. 2002) (*per curiam*). The exhaustion requirement applies to all prisoner suits relating to  
9 prison life. *Porter v. Nussle*, 534 U.S. 516, 532 (2002). Exhaustion is required regardless of the  
10 relief sought by the prisoner and regardless of the relief offered by the process, unless “the  
11 relevant administrative procedure lacks authority to provide any relief or to take any action  
12 whatsoever in response to a complaint.” *Booth v. Churner*, 532 U.S. 731, 736, 741 (2001); *Ross*  
13 *v. Blake*, 578 U.S. 632, 643 (2016).

14           Under the PLRA, a grievance suffices if it alerts the prison to the nature of the  
15 wrong for which redress is sought. The grievance need not include legal  
16 terminology or legal theories, because [t]he primary purpose of a grievance is to  
17 alert the prison to a problem and facilitate its resolution, not to lay groundwork  
18 for litigation. The grievance process is only required to alert prison officials to a  
19 problem, not to provide personal notice to a particular official that he may be  
20 sued.

21           *Reyes*, 810 F.3d at 659 (alteration in original) (citations and internal quotation marks  
22 omitted).

23           As discussed in *Ross*, 578 U.S. at 639, there are no “special circumstances” exceptions  
24 to the exhaustion requirement. The one significant qualifier is that “the remedies must indeed  
25 be ‘available’ to the prisoner.” *Id.* The *Ross* Court described this qualification as follows:

26           [A]n administrative procedure is unavailable when (despite what  
27 regulations or guidance materials may promise) it operates as a simple  
28 dead end—with officers unable or consistently unwilling to provide  
any relief to aggrieved inmates. *See* 532 U.S., at 736, 738, 121 S.Ct.  
1819. . . .

29           Next, an administrative scheme might be so opaque that it becomes,  
30 practically speaking, incapable of use. . . .

1 And finally, the same is true when prison administrators thwart  
 2 inmates from taking advantage of a grievance process through  
 3 machination, misrepresentation, or intimidation. . . . As all those courts  
 4 have recognized, such interference with an inmate's pursuit of relief  
 renders the administrative process unavailable. And then, once again,  
 § 1997e(a) poses no bar.

5 *Id.* at 643–44.

6 If the Court concludes that Plaintiff has failed to exhaust, the proper remedy is dismissal  
 7 without prejudice of the portions of the complaint barred by section 1997e(a). *Jones*, 549 U.S.  
 8 at 223–24; *Lira v. Herrera*, 427 F.3d 1164, 1175–76 (9th Cir. 2005).

9 When it is clear on the face of the complaint that a plaintiff failed to exhaust  
 10 administrative remedies, dismissal is proper. *Albino v. Baca*, 747 F.3d 1162, 1166 (9th Cir.  
 11 2014).

12 **II. ANALYSIS**

13 It appears from the face of the complaint that Plaintiff did not exhaust her available  
 14 administrative remedies before filing this action. Plaintiff's complaint indicates that the  
 15 grievance procedure was not completed at the time she filed her complaint because she had not  
 16 yet filed an appeal or grievance concerning the facts contained in the complaint. (ECF No. 1 at  
 17 2).

18 Accordingly, the Court will order Plaintiff to show cause why this action should not be  
 19 dismissed for failure to exhaust available administrative remedies before filing this lawsuit. The  
 20 Court notes that this dismissal would be without prejudice. Therefore, if Plaintiff exhausts her  
 21 administrative remedies in the future, she could refile the complaint.

22 In response to this order, the Court also welcomes Plaintiff to file any documents she  
 23 believes demonstrates that she has exhausted all available administrative remedies.

24 **III. CONCLUSION AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

25 Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that,

26 1. Within **thirty (30) days** from the date of service of this order, Plaintiff shall show  
 27 cause why this action should not be dismissed, without prejudice, for failure to

1 exhaust available administrative remedies.

2 2. Alternatively, Plaintiff may file a notice of voluntary dismissal, in which case the

3 Court will dismiss the case without prejudice such that Plaintiff may refile the case

4 after exhausting administrative remedies.

5 3. A failure to comply with this order may result in the dismissal of Plaintiff's case.

6

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: June 9, 2025

*/s/ Evan P. Groj*

9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28